

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for extending the courtesy of granting an in-person interview on January 27, 2009, at 11:00 a.m.

Related Submission

Submitted herewith is a Submission In Accordance With M.P.E.P. §713.04 summarizing the January 27, 2009 in-person interview between the applicant, applicant's attorneys and the Examiner. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication in the Examiner's January 29, 2009 Interview Summary form that new claims 90-147 overcome the Examiner's previous rejections over Greening and Harvey.

Amendments to claims 90, 124, 125 and 158

Claims 90, 124 and 158 have been amended, pursuant to the January 27, 2009 in-person interview. In particular, feature (e) of claim 1, feature (iv) of claim 124 and feature (3) of claim 158 have been amended to recite "wherein at least one trait or preference of the second demographic is not included in the first demographic defined by the first request for electronic information." Pursuant to the Examiner's suggestion during the January 27, 2009 interview, the amendment to these claims clarifies the "right turn" feature represented, for example, in Figs. 11A and 12, and discussed during the interview.

Further, claim 125 has been amended to correct an obvious typographical error.

Support In Specification Pursuant to Examiner's Request

During the January 27, 2009 interview, and as indicated in the Examiner's January 29, 2009 Interview Summary form, the applicant has been requested to identify support in the specification for subject matter claimed in new claims 90-159. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Figs. 11A and 12 and further to applicant's written disclosure, including at page 11, line 20 - page 12, line 8, that illustrate and describe a representative supporting example embodiment. In particular, Fig. 11A provides an example of a request for information by a user and that corresponds to the user's selected trait and/or preference parameter, in this case people who chose the band, "InSync," as their favorite group.

Fig. 12 shows an example display screen showing the results of the first request that include ten individuals comprising a first demographic, that, as described in applicant's written specification, meet "trait and preference criteria supplied by the user in their search." Fig. 12 also shows a FACTOID related to a second demographic, in this instance, "people like Pete." The FACTOID uses advertiser relevant information, in this case, "COKE."

The Examiner is further directed to Fig. 7, which shows another example illustrating a "FACTOID."


Applicant submits that these and other examples set forth in the drawings and written specification support applicant's claims 90-159, including, "wherein at least one of the one or more of traits and preferences of the second demographic is not included in the first demographic defined by the first request for electronic information."

Conclusion

The Examiner is requested to call applicant's representatives should he have any questions or would like to discuss any issues to further expedite the allowance of the present patent application. Applicant respectfully maintains that, as set forth in the response filed on January 19, 2009 and in the in-person interview on January 27, 2009, this application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH
THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS
FILING SYSTEM ON January 30, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,



Joel J. Felber
Registration No.: 59,642
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

DAM:JFF:ck